Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Project Name: Diamond Bar Post and Stay Permit

NEPA Number DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2011-0035-CX

Α.	Backgroun	nd

BLM Office: Kingman Field Office Lease/Serial/Case File No.: _____

Proposed Action Title/Type: Diamond Bar post and stay permit. The permittee plans to use posts and stays on rebuilding a water lot on New water Mesa within the allotment. No commercial use or purpose is intended.

Location of Proposed Action: T28, 29,30N, R16W

Description of Proposed Action: Huck Sandsness, authorized representative for the Diamond Bar Allotment has submitted a request for a fence post and stay cutting permit for 150 juniper posts and 1000 stays within the allotment boundary as needed. This permit would be used within the Diamond Bar allotment for maintenance only. Slash will be lop and scatter. Cutting areas were cleared by BLM Range, Wildlife, and Cultural Resource Specialists.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS

Date Approved/Amended: March 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

GM-10/VIB Manage 21 allotments in the Improve (I) category (RMP page 461).

VP05/I Meet public demand for vegetative resources on public lands on a sustained yield

basis without impairing resources.

C: Compliance with NEPA:

This Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9 : (C) Forestry-5: "Disposal

of small amounts of miscellaneous vegetation products outside established harvest areas, such as Christmas trees, wildings, floral products (ferns, boughs, etc.), cones, seeds, and personal use firewood."

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed (See Attachment 1), and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM2 apply.

I considered the plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan, and none of the exceptions described in 516 DM2 apply, and no further environmental analysis is required.

	0		
Name: _	/ s / Don McClure	Date:10/28/2011	
Title:	Assistant Field Manager	_	

E. Contact Person

D: Authorizing Official

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact Abe Clark, Rangeland Management Specialist (928-718-3755) at the Kingman Field Office located at 2755 Mission Blvd, Kingman, Arizona, 86401.

Attachment 1: Extraordinary Circumstances Review

Extraordinary Circumstances	Comment (Yes or No with supporting Rationale)
1. Have significant effects on public health or safety.	No
2. Have significant impacts on such natural	No, juniper encroachment occurs in locations on the
resources and unique geographic characteristics as	allotment and infrequent harvesting of posts and
historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or	stays for fence maintenance would not be
refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers;	significant.
national natural landmarks; sole or principal	6
drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands	
(Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive	
Order 11988) national monuments; migratory birds;	
and other ecologically significant or critical areas.	
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects	No
or involve unresolved conflicts concerning	
alternative uses of available resources [NEPA	
Section 102(2)(E)].	
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant	No
environmental effects or involve unique or unknown	
environmental risks.	
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or	No
represents a decision in principle about future	
actions with significant environmental effects.	
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with	No
individually insignificant but cumulatively	
significant environmental effects.	
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or	No
eligible for listing, on the National Register of	
Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or	
office.	
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or	No
proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or	
Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on	
designated Critical Habitat for these species.	
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal	No
law or requirement imposed for the protection of the	
environment.	
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse	No
effect on low income or minority populations	
(Executive Order 12898).	
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian	No
sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious	
practitioners or significantly adversely affect the	
physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive	
Order 13007).	
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued	No
existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native	
invasive species known to occur in the area or	
actions that may promote the introduction, growth,	
or expansion of the range of such species (Federal	
Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order	
13112).	

Approval and Decision Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment/ s / Abe Clark	of responsibility: (Range Program, Abe Clark) 10/17/2011		
Monitoring and assignment / s / Abe Clark	of responsibility: (Range Program, Abe Clark) 10/17/2011		
criteria and that it wo	termined that the proposal is in accordance with uld not involve any significant environmental effeld from further environmental review.		
Prepared by:	/ s / Abe Clark	Date:	_10/28/2011
	Abe Clark, Rangeland Mgt. Specialist Project Lead		
Reviewed by:		Date:	
	Dave Brock NEPA Coordinator		
oject Description: (cut/paste	description of the project here.)		
ermined that the project is in	the project described above and field office staff conformance with the land use plan and is catego decision to approve the action as proposed, with	orically ex	cluded from further
oproved By:/ s / Don M	Don McClure Assistant Field Manager, Kingman Field Office	_10/28/20	011

Exhibits:

1) **Stipulations:** The area of post and stay harvest would be approved and monitored by BLM.

PROJECT COORDINATION

Minutes 10:30 a.m. June 7, 2011

Facilitator: Ammon Wilhelm Recorder: Abe Clark Timekeeper: Dave Brock **Agenda Items:** Brief description, legal description, general location, name of presenter, time needed.

Rules: 90 minute meetings

No side conversations Stick to time limits

Additional agenda items added at end of meeting if time permits

PAST DUE CLEARANCES:

DECISION RECORDS TO BE DISCUSSED:

NEPA LOG (update on each project in the log) at end of meeting:

PROJECTS:

- 1. Diamond Bar post and stay permit. The permittee plans to use posts and stays on rebuilding a water lot, fences, and corrals within the allotment. No commercial use or purpose is intended. The permit would be for 300 juniper posts and 1000 stays within the allotment boundary as needed. This permit would be used within the Diamond Bar allotment for maintenance only. Slash will be lop and scatter. The main area used would be in barks canyon, an area on new water mesa may also be used depending on site visit. Are there private lands that have juniper on them that would work? Would this require a cultural clearance? Discuss size of stays and what they will be used for. Should/can we charge him? Cultural Tim Watkins, Wildlife Ammon Wilhelm (Abe Clark 10 min)
- 2. Pine Peak prescribed fire proposal. Proposal is to implement light understory burn in ponderosa pine stand on Pine Peak in Hualapai Mountains during fall-winter months (September to March). The pine stand is approximately 412 acres and located in T17N, R15W, sections 3, 4, 9, and 10. The proposal includes use of hand and/or aerial ignition. All conservation measures and terms and conditions of the biological opinion (AESO/SE 2-21-01-F-241) dated December 14, 2001 would be followed. Snags, large downed logs, large diameter ponderosa pine and Gambel oak trees, and range improvements would be prepped (i.e., duff/litter concentrations raked away) and/or avoided where necessary to minimize their loss. Look at fence, cultural clearance (Tim Watkins) and Fish and Wildlife consultation. (W. Boyett 10 minutes).

Attendees: Len Marceau, Paul Hobbs, Dave Brock, Ammon Wilhelm, Don McClure, Abe Clark, Bill Boyett, Andy Whitefield, Randy Allison, Rebecca Peck,

Next meeting: June 20, 1:30 p.m.

Facilitator: Andy Whitefield Recorder: Rebecca Peck Timekeeper: Paul Hobbs